

PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of

Docket No: Q79793

Hirofumi HONDA, et al.

Allowed: October 30, 2007

Appln. No.: 10/781,722

Group Art Unit: 2629

Confirmation No.: 4189

Examiner: Prabodh M. DHARIA

Filed: February 20, 2004

For: DISPLAY PANEL DRIVER HAVING MULTI-GRAYSCALE PROCESSING
FUNCTION

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

ATTN: MAIL STOP ISSUE FEE

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

REMARKS

Applicant offers the following comments in response to the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance set forth on page 5 of the Notice of Allowability dated October 30, 2007.

The Reasons for Allowance state that "applicant has agreed and authorized examiner to do examiner amendments... to overcome newly cited prior art of Uehara et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,663,772." Applicant respectfully disagrees with this statement to the extent that it suggests that Applicant authorized entry of the proposed Examiner's Amendment to overcome the Uehara reference. To the contrary, none of the claims in the present application were ever rejected based on the Uehara reference and no detailed grounds of rejection were set forth explaining how Uehara purportedly renders any of the aforementioned claims unpatentable. Consequently, Applicant has never had an opportunity to fully address and respond to the merits of any such purported rejections. In fact, Applicant expressly maintains that Applicant's authorization for

the proposed amendments to claim 16 was not granted to overcome Uehara (since no rejections were ever issued based on Uehara). To the contrary, Applicant's authorization for the proposed amendments to claim 16 was granted merely in an effort to expedite prosecution of the present application.

Further, Applicant notes that independent reasons, other than those cited by the Examiner, exist for the allowability of claims 1-16 and 18-20.

Patent Office personnel are requested to note that the present submission does not adversely affect the patent term adjustment accrued by the Applicant to date. As emphasized in the "Clarification of 37 C.F.R. §1.704(c)(10) – Reduction of Patent Term Adjustment for Certain Types of Papers Filed After a Notice of Allowance Has Been Mailed," 1247OG111 (6/26/01), "a response to the examiner's reasons for allowance" is an example of a paper that does "not cause substantial interference and delay in the patent issue process" and is "not considered a 'failure to engage in reasonable efforts' to conclude processing or examination of the application."

Therefore, the Applicant remains entitled to the full patent term adjustment set forth on page 3 of the Notice of Allowance dated October 30, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Andrew J. Taska /

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 19, 2007

Andrew J. Taska
Registration No. 54,666